MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 18, 1938

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, November 18, 1938. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Manship,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Lamb,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting, held October 15, 1938, were approved.

2. NEW PIANO FOR THE WHITE HOUSE: Mr. Savage reported that he and Mr. Manship recently inspected the new piano for the White House at Steinway's studio and approved it. Mr. Savage said: "I have seen it twice--the second time only four days ago. I criticized certain treatment of the painting and a few little things but I am definitely of the impression that December 1, is rushing it a bit from the artist's point of view. Beck has done a fine job of the side panel." Mr. Manship said that Mr. Stewart has improved the design of the eagles. The bracket for the support of the cover has to be completed but that is a detail that will be followed up by Eric Gugler. On the recommendation of Mr. Savage and Mr. Manship the Commission approved the new piano with pleasure. A report was sent to Mr. Theodore Steinway and to Eric Gugler. (Exhibits A and A-1) (See also A-2)

3. J. Q. A. WARD STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL: Mr. Clarke said that at a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Academy in Rome, he was informed by Mr. Herbert Adams of a bronze statue of George Washington by J. Q. A. Ward cast by the Gorham Company in 1932,

the price of which at that time was $25,000, but which now can be secured for $15,000. Mr. Clarke filed a letter from Mr. Herbert Adams on the subject. (Exhibit B) A letter, dated November 11, 1938, from Mr. John Gregory, President of the National Sculpture Society, who urged that the statue be secured for Washington, commended the statue in the following words:

> "I think it is one of the finest of our national memorials, one of the first half dozen of our great statues, and I hope that a replica of it may be set up in the city of Washington."

The Commission expressed its hearty approval of securing the statue for the National Capital.

The secretary reported that a full sized model of the statue was placed on the steps of the National Museum facing the Mall in connection with the exhibition by the National Sculpture Society and by the American Academy in Rome during the George Washington Bicentennial in 1932, and that in March 1933, the model was used for the Court of Honor in front of the White House during the inauguration of the President. It would be necessary to secure legislation from Congress to place the statue in Washington and one of the first questions the Committee on the Library would ask is where the statue should be located.

The Commission felt that it would be appropriate to place the statue near the Capitol. After the discussion the Chairman appointed Mr. Borie and Mr. Manship to recommend a location for the statue, whereupon the matter will be taken up with the House and Senate Committees on the Library.

4. MURAL PAINTING BY MISS LOUISE ORCHARD: Under date of October 26, 1938, the following letter was referred by Hon. Stephen Early, Secretary to the President, to the Commission for attention:

October 17th

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

> A short while ago I planned to write you a note telling you about a mural I am painting which is to contain caricatures both

of yourself and of the President. But I feel it might be nicer to ask for your consent--your "blessing" as it were--before painting it.

The mural is to be in the new Alber-Cady Restaurant in New York City. Its setting is a mild sort of jungle, and the characters, including also Albert Einstein, Shirley Temple, Mahatma Ghandi, Herbert Hoover, Harpo Marx, Al Smith, Charlie McCarthy, Hitler, Mussolini, Benny Goodman, and the Duke and Duchess of Windsor, will be clothed (very modestly) in animal skins, with occasional inconsistencies to add to the fun. The caricatures are in no sense malicious, but are, of course, intended to be amusing.

You are to be depicted carrying a large stone of hyroglyphics under your arm, entitled--if I can make it understandable in signs--"My Day," chatting with Charlie McCarthy.* The President in another group is seated by a camp fire and speaking into a microphone, whilst Mr. Hoover is placing, over the same fire, three little chickens into three little pots.

I hope to make the mural a work of art as well as a signal for gaiety. As I have always admired and respected you, I feel that no one could take offense on your behalf, as I can see nothing disrespectful in the mural. However were you to be so kind as to let me know whether or not you have any objections, I'm sure it would calm anyone who seemed shocked at putting our First Lady in a jungle.

Strangely enough I feel much more that I'm writing to a personal friend than to the First Lady. Perhaps it is because of the one time I saw you, but I think it's more being in sympathy with so much of what you have done and are doing. How many letters you must receive from people who consider you their friend.

Do you think I should write to the President too, or could your reply be for both of you? I will not carry the work on the mural any further until I hear from you. Thank you so much.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) Louise Orchard.

* Charlie has no significance--
I just like him.

The letter was referred to Mr. Savage for consideration and report, which he made as follows:

The permission asked of Mrs. Roosevelt by Louise H. Orchard, to depict the President and Mrs. Roosevelt in caricature for mural painting purposes has been received and considered.

It seems clearly the intention in characterizing them, to appeal to the absurd and ridiculous. Their exalted position is not a good reason for their being victimized by this request, which is not a proper one to have made, however playful the mood.

Apparently the only defence the President and his family has in such matters is public resentment at bad taste.

The Commission heartily approved the report and sent it to Mr. Early. (Exhibit C)

5. "BYRD" SUNDIAL FOR WASHINGTON: Under date of November 1, 1938, a communication was received from Senator Augustine Lonergan, transmitting the following letter from Mr. Joseph R. Swain:

October 25, 1938.

My dear Senator Lonergan:

Under another cover I am sending you a picture of a bronze sundial which I designed and sculptured and then had cast in bronze. You will notice that it commemorates the expeditions of Admiral Byrd.

I have been endeavoring to sell a number of the replicas at $150 each, and have directed that all money over the actual cost of the castings be turned over to Admiral Byrd toward the expenses of his next expedition. I am writing to you only to inquire if there is any governmental agency which might be interested in the dial as part of the record of a great explorer's service to our time; or do you know of any person or organization which might be interested in giving a replica of it to the National Museum or any other public institution?

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Joseph R. Swain.

The letter was referred to Mr. Manship for consideration and report, as follows:

In response to your communication concerning the bronze sundial designed for commemoration of the expeditions of Admiral Richard Byrd, I may say that I know of no organizations or individuals who would be interested in such a sundial. It does not strike me as being of sufficient artistic interest to be worthy of the attention of the Fine Arts Commission.

The Commission concurred in the report and Mr. Swain was advised accordingly. (Exhibit D)

6. APARTMENT BUILDING, 2121 VIRGINIA AVENUE: Mr. Joseph H. Abel, designer of the building, referred to the Commission a letter received from the United Clay Products Company (Exhibit E) advising that a gray brick will be used for the new apartment building at 2121 Virginia Avenue in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission. A letter of appreciation for his cooperation in this matter was sent to Mr. Abel. (Exhibit E-1)

7. MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE UNDERPASS: Captain H. C. Whitehurst submitted a set of working drawings for the Massachusetts Avenue underpass at Thomas Circle. The Commission endorsed the suggestion of Mr. Lamb that the pilasters of stainless steel at the entrance to the underpass be made heavier and that they be backed by some other material so as to keep the steel from buckling and not appearing wavy. Captain Whitehurst also submitted samples of blue and buff semi-glazed tile for the interior of the underpass. The Commission considered this satisfactory and better than white tile, which is generally used, but which shows the dirt readily. Captain Whitehurst said that in their contract with the engineers, they have required good lighting, good ventilation and perfect drainage. He also said that the bids for the project will be opened in a few days. There was question about the ceiling material for the tunnel and Captain Whitehurst said that they were treating the ceiling with a new material that is used on concrete. It gives a very good appearance and the color will in general match that of the tile though it is just a shade lighter. Mr. Clarke said that not many will see the ceiling but a good reflecting surface is desirable for the light.

8. NEW PUBLIC LIBRARY: The following letter was received from Dr. George F. Bowerman, Librarian of the District of Columbia Public Library:

16 November 1938

Gentlemen:

Following is an extract from the minutes of the last regular meeting of the Board of Library Trustees, held on November 10:

> "Mr. Atwood, chairman of the Committee on Buildings, reported that earlier in the day Mr. Wyeth, the Municipal Architect, and his assistant, Mr. Cuthriell, had met with the committee and had shown tentative sketch plans for the new central library building. These plans consisted of one design for a rectangular building and one for a trapezoid building, that is, one in which the front facade would be parallel with Pennsylvania Avenue. The librarian and assistant librarian from their studies of the plans gave it as their opinion that a building according to the latter plan would be less desirable from an administrative point of view since it would result in one that would be less efficient and more expensive to administer.
>
> "Mr. Atwood therefore recommended that in view of the greater utility of a rectangular building, the Board should express its preference therefor and at a coming joint meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the National Commission of Fine Arts that the chairman of the committee and the librarian should state the Board's judgment to this effect. Voted."

We should appreciate it if we could be present at the joint meeting of your two Commissions when Mr. Wyeth, the Municipal Architect, presents the matter of the placement and design of the new central building for the Free Public Library.

As we understand the matter, the Municipal Architect cannot proceed any further with the preparation of plans and specifications for the building until these questions are decided.

On behalf of the Board of Library Trustees,

Very respectfully,
(Signed) Albert W. Atwood, Chairman,
Committee on Buildings.

(Signed) George F. Bowerman,
Librarian and Secretary.

In considering the matter the Commission were at first inclined to concur in Dr. Bowerman's recommendation for a rectangular building since such a building would be parallel to the National Gallery of Art. Looking at a map, it

seemed to the Commission that the library would be too far removed from the Apex Building, which is parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue. It was decided, therefore, to visit the place later in the day. A memorandum that had been prepared by Mr. Partridge, Consulting Architect of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, was read. (Exhibit F)

The Commission inspected the location at Pennsylvania Avenue and John Marshall Place at noon. The view indicated to the Commission strongly that the location called for a building that would form a portal with the Apex Building at the junction of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues. The matter was further considered at the joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission during the afternoon. A report was sent by Dr. Bowerman accordingly, recommending a building parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue. (Exhibit F-1)

9. NATIONAL MUSEUM BUILDING EXTENSIONS: The Commission considered the question of constructing additions to the east and west ends of the National Museum Building and also made an inspection of the exterior of the building. A memorandum on the subject made by Mr. Partridge for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission was read. (Exhibit G)

The Commission felt decidedly after inspecting the building that the proposed extensions should not be built but that instead the ground on the north side of the Mall between 12th and 14th Streets should be made available for a new museum building. The Commission considered the matter further during the afternoon session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, at which time Mr. Clarke presented the views of the Commission of Fine Arts, saying: "The Natural History Building was built many years ago as a self-contained unit and in the style of museum buildings in vogue at the beginning of this century. Additions to the east and west ends of the building would have to conform to the

style of the old building, resulting in a structure too large in mass for the Mall. The additions would cause the central part of the building, including the dome, to become completely out of scale. Also the work would be done at great expense since the east and west end walls would practically have to be demolished. Thus it would be a serious mistake to carry out the project." Mr. Clarke stated further that the Commission realizes the need for additional museum space and recommended the erection of a building in the square on the north side of the Mall between 12th and 14th Streets constructed in two sections above the first story on Constitution Avenue in such a way as to retain the view from the Mall of the central portico of the Labor Department Building. A letter disapproving the proposed extension and recommending an additional building was sent to Dr. Wetmore. (Exhibit G-1)

10. BULFINCH GATEHOUSES: Mr. Malcolm Kirkpatrick, landscape architect, submitted in behalf of the National Park Service a set of drawings for the restoration of the Bulfinch Gatehouses along Constitution Avenue, to be so oriented in their present locations at 15th and 17th Streets as to face Constitution Avenue. The Commission inspected the drawings and approved them with the understanding that the gatehouses will be placed on a level with the sidewalk and face Constitution Avenue.

11. PLANTING PLAN FOR THE GREAT ENTRANCE TO ARLINGTON: Mr. Kirkpatrick submitted a planting plan for the Great Entrance to Arlington. The plan proposes ivy to overhang the granite facade and boxwood for screen. The Commission also suggested the planting of oak trees. Mr. Clarke favored using the red oak, 10-12 inches in diameter. The plan was approved accordingly.

During the discussion of the question of highways on Columbia Island and the future disposition of the railroad track to Rosslyn, the question of filling the channel between Columbia Island and the Virginia mainland was considered.

Mr. Clarke stated that there should be no objection to filling the channel as it serves no particular use and such filling would result in the saving of the cost of bridges. The channel is stagnant, swampy and it is not much used for boating. The bridge for the Mount Vernon Highway at the south end of the channel cost $2,000,000. Mr. Kirkpatrick said Major Luplow, District Engineer, told him the channel is of no particular value in time of flood because it is too shallow.

12. ST. INIGOES MEMORIAL: The Navy Department submitted a revised design for the St. Inigoes Memorial with letter as follows:

November 17, 1938.

Subject: USS TULIP Memorial, near St. Inigoes Bay, Maryland.

References: (a) Bu. Y&D letter A12-2 of 7 Oct. 1938.
(b) Your letter of 17 Oct. 1938.

Enclosures: 2 Sketches (Under separate cover).

Gentlemen:

The suggestions presented in reference (b) relative to the design of the St. Inigoes memorial have been noted, and the Bureau is submitting under separate cover alternative designs for the further consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts. The black-and-white sketches indicate two designs of memorials cut from single blocks of stone, with simple intaglio cuttings. For sketch A, a light granite has been suggested, and for sketch B, a dark granite.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) B. Moreell,
Chief of Bureau.

Scheme A suggested a perpendicular monument and Scheme B a squared block of stone. The Commission approved Scheme A with the recommendation that the sculptural motif and inscription be carved and not sand blasted. Admiral Moreell was advised accordingly. (Exhibit H)

13. "STAINED" GLASS WINDOWS FOR CHAPEL IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK: The National Park Service submitted designs for two so-called stained glass windows

which Miss Jessie Van Brunt, 212 Gates Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, proposes to make and give for the vestibule of the chapel at Mammoth Hot Springs, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming.

The sketches were referred to Mr. Savage for criticism. He called attention to the fact that these are to be painted windows and not stained glass, that is, windows made of colored glass. Mr. Borie said painted windows are the lowest form of stained glass window. Mr. Lamb noted from circulars illustrating Miss Van Brunt's work in different parts of the country that she both made and gave the windows in every instance. Mr. Savage said the sketches are of unsuitable composition and style and should be redesigned.

As to the nature of the building in which the murals would go, Mr. Clarke stated that it is a stone chapel, rather rustic in character.

After discussion the Commission decided that even though these windows would be 3,000 miles away they should not have the approval of the Commission since they do not meet the standard of genuine stained glass windows. The Commission therefore disapproved the sketches and a report was sent to the National Park Service accordingly. (Exhibit I)

14. MARCONI MEMORIAL: The Commission considered further the question of location of the Marconi Memorial. Mr. Clarke said he felt after further consideration that the location suggested at the meeting on October 15, across from the National Academy of Sciences and near the Lincoln Memorial, was not the right place for the Marconi Memorial. After discussion it was suggested that the memorial be placed in Meridian Hill Park. A trip of inspection was made to the park at noon. The Commission agreed that an appropriate place for the memorial would be in the lower garden of Meridian Hill Park in the overlook along 16th Street directly west of the statue of Dante. The portrait statue

of Marconi by Mr. Piccirilli could be placed on a low pedestal. The Commission recommended Mr. Horace Peaslee as the architect of the pedestal. A report was sent to the Marconi Memorial Foundation recommending the site above mentioned in the lower garden of Meridian Hill Park. (Exhibit J)

15. STONEWALL JACKSON MONUMENT: The secretary submitted a letter (Exhibit K) from Mr. Philip N. Stern, Chairman of the Virginia Art Commission, requesting advice with regard to the jury for the monument.

Mr. Manship stated that he had sent a letter to Mr. Stern declining to serve on the jury since a model would subsequently have to be submitted to the Commission. The Commission thereupon considered the personnel of the jury. The appointment of Mr. Zorach was not favored since it was stated he has had no experience in animal sculpture. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Manship the following were suggested for the jury: Mr. John Gregory, Mr. Albert Stewart, and Mr. Michael Lantz, who is now at work on the equestrian groups for the Apex Building. A report was sent to Mr. Stern accordingly. (Exhibit K-1)

16. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS:

a. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Borie the Commission approved an advertising sign for the Washington Laundry Company at 2150 P Street, N. W., application No. 733. Mr. Borie reported that he visited the location in company with Mr. Caemmerer on the afternoon of November 17.

b. The Commission approved an advertising sign, "Liggett's Drugs", at the corner of 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, with the understanding that the area of the advertising signs on the building will not be increased thereby. (Application No. 728)

c. The Commission disapproved the alteration of a show window projection over the building line at 229-31 Pennsylvania Avenue, S. E., because such would allow building on public property. (Application No. 736)

d. The Commission approved an advertising sign at 313 Second Street, S. W., with the understanding that the sign will be reduced to 25 square feet. (Application No. 738).

e. A design for a residence at 2800-28th Street, N. W. (Application No. 734) was inspected by Mr. Lorie and Mr. Lamb and approved with the understanding that the architect, Mr. Stone of New York City, submit a sample of the brick to be used. Attention was called to the fact that this was to be a one story building of the Frank Lloyd Wright type. (Mr. Lamb reported on November 29 that Mr. Stone had informed him that gray cement paint will be used for the outer wall covering and Mr. Lamb considered this satisfactory.) (Exhibit L)

17. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: The Commission received a protest from the Hotel Association of Washington (Exhibit M) against the demolition of cherry trees near the Tidal Basin and the erection of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial on that site. The Commission discussed the matter and the Chairman asked how other protests which might be received should be answered. The Commission decided to reply as follows:

We wish to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts does not approve the building that is to be erected for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial on that site.

A letter was sent to the Hotel Association of Washington accordingly. (Exhibit M-1)

18. NEW WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: During the joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in the afternoon Mr. Simon submitted studies for the new War Department Building. The discussion developed that a high building was being proposed at 23rd Street near the Naval Hospital and its appropriateness near the Lincoln Memorial was therefore questioned. After lengthy discussion Mr. Simon was asked to give further study to a War Department Building that would face south on C Street between 21st and 23rd Streets so that the mass

of the building would extend back to E Street.

19. ALBERT GALLATIN STATUE: The Commission approved placing the Albert Gallatin Statue on the north side of the Treasury Department Building with the understanding that the existing fountain at the site will be removed to some other place.

20. OSCAR STRAUS MEMORIAL: The Secretary reported that the Oscar Straus Memorial Association has recently made further effort to secure permission from the Treasury Department to locate their memorial in the Great Plaza along 14th Street but the Treasury Department has withheld an answer in view of the fact that a $500,000 appropriation is needed to develop the Great Plaza. The question was raised whether or not the Treasury Department would agree to abolishing the existing open air garage at the site and have the Great Plaza simply graded, costing approximately $50,000. A letter was sent to Mr. Louis Simon asking for the views of the Treasury Department in respect to this matter. (Exhibit N)

21. RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF CHARLES Z. KLAUDER: The Commission heard with much regret of the death of Charles Z. Klauder of Philadelphia on Sunday, October 30, 1938. The Chairman appointed Mr. Borie to draft a resolution for adoption by the Commission.

The Commission adjourned at 6:00 p. m.

C O P Y

The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C.

November 26, 1938.

Dear Mr. Steinway:

On November 18th, 1938, the Commission of Fine Arts were informed by Messrs. Paul Manship and Eugene Savage, members of the Commission of Fine Arts, that they had inspected the new piano for the White House upon which Messrs. Gugler, Beck and Stewart collaborated with you in the design. Upon the unqualified and enthusiastic recommendation of these two members, the Commission take much pleasure in approving the instrument.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke

GILMORE D. CLARKE,
Chairman.

Mr. Theodore Steinway,
109 West 57th Street,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C.

November 26, 1938.

My dear Mr. Gugler:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter the Commission have sent to Mr. Theodore Steinway approving the new piano for the White House. It is understood that the bracket for the support of the cover has not as yet been completed and that this work will take more time. When this element is ready for inspection, I shall be pleased to have Messrs. Savage and Manship inspect it.

The Commission are much pleased with the design of the instrument.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke

GILMORE D. CLARKE,
Chairman.

Mr. Eric Gugler,
101 Park Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT A-1

# STEINWAY & SONS

PIANO MAKERS
STEINWAY HALL 109 WEST 57TH ST.
LONDON NEW YORK HAMBURG

November 29, 1938.

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON D. C.
NOV 30 1938

NOTED

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I received this morning your nice letter of November 26th putting the stamp of your approval upon the piano that we have constructed to be placed in the White House. Let me extend to you, as well as for the members of my house, most grateful thanks for all your patience and courtesy and understanding interest in the matter. Would you be kind enough to convey these sentiments to the Art Commission?

Very truly yours,

Theodore E. Steinway

Theodore E. Steinway,
President.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A-2

C O P Y

THE GORHAM COMPANY
BRONZE DIVISION
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

October 19, 1938

Mr. Herbert Adams
131 West 11th Street
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Adams:

You are no doubt familiar with the fact that late in the year 1931 and early in 1932, we cast in bronze a replica of the J.Q.A. Ward statue of Washington now on the Sub-Treasury steps in New York City, and which is considered the finest and most adequate representation of Washington, as it seemed to be the desire of the sculptors to make this statue in the keynote of the Bi-Centennial celebration in the National Capitol in the year 1932. Permission for such use had been secured from Mrs. Ward, widow of the sculptor, and from Secretary Mellon.

According to memo which I have before me, the venture was sponsored by us more or less at the suggestion of the National Sculpture Society. Naturally, we anticipated a formal order would be sent to us in due time covering the project. In response to our inquiries during the early summer of 1932, we received thru the Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts advice that a formal purchase order as planned would involve an Act of Congress. He therefore drew up a resolution which Senator Wagner presented to the 72nd Congress, Second Session S5421, December 8, 1932. Since that date we do not seem to have any definite information other than that the resolution was presented and no action taken.

This splendid bronze statue stands here on our grounds at the present time and our prime problem in connection with it is to get our money out of it at an early date if possible. Of course, we have had to pursue that course which fits in with the royalty agreement with Mrs. Ward, since deceased. We now have written arrangements with Mrs. Ward's heirs to waive this royalty, thereby enabling us to offer this bronze for the sum of $15,000 or $10,000 less that originally planned. We emphasize that the above agreement pertains to this particular statue only and noother replicas can be made without permission of the Ward heirs who would no doubt insist upon full royalty payment, as originally planned.

Naturally, we would prefer to see this statue placed in the National Capitol at Washington in a location of sufficient importance, for today no outstanding statue of Washington stands in that city. If this cannot be arranged at an early date we are planning to offer this statue for sale to anyone interested in purchasing it for placement in any location they may deem proper, which means it may ultimately be placed in either one of the forty eight states or possible South America.

EXHIBIT B

October 19, 1938

Mr. Herbert Adams

As a member of the Fine Arts Commission or a member of the National Sculpture Society, we feel you are interested in this particular statue and are writing you as above so you may know our intentions as regards our efforts to dispose of it.

We would be gratified to receive from you any advices you may have to give or the addresses of persons who might be interested in arranging for its purchase.

We hope we may rely on your good offices in this regard and for your convenience we enclose return addressed envelope for your kind reply direct to our offices and foundry here at Providence.

Very truly yours,

THE GORHAM COMPANY
BRONZE DIVISION

(Signed) W. F. Bennett

W. F. Bennett

WFB/aw

C O P Y

November 18, 1938.

Dear Mr. Early:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to the letter from Miss Louise H. Orchard, 17 Masterton Road, Bronxville, New York, dated October 17, addressed to Mrs. Roosevelt, which you referred to the Commission of Fine Arts for advice. The Commission respectfully report as follows:

> The permission asked of Mrs. Roosevelt by Louise H. Orchard, to depict the President and Mrs. Roosevelt in caricature for mural painting purposes has been received and considered.
>
> It seems clearly the intention in characterizing them, to appeal to the absurd and ridiculous. Their exalted position is not a good reason for their being victimized by this request, which is not a proper one to have made, however playful the mood.
>
> Apparently the only defence the President and his family has in such matters is public resentment at bad taste.
>
> The letter from Miss Orchard is herewith returned.

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Stephen Early,
Secretary to the President,
The White House.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

November 18, 1938.

Dear Mr. Swain:

The Commission of Fine Arts received through Senator Augustine Lonergan a photograph of a bronze sundial designed by you for commemoration of the expeditions of Admiral Byrd, together with a copy of your letter of August 25, asking if a replica of the sundial could be sold to Government agencies.

Inquiry has been made but we know of no organization or individual who is interested in such a sundial as you have to offer. The photograph is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Joseph R. Swain,
92 Pearl Street,
Seymour, Connecticut.

EXHIBIT D

# The United Clay Products Company

INVESTMENT BUILDING

Washington, D. C.

RECEIVED
FINE ARTS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C.
OCT 27 1938
NOTED

October 25, 1938.

Dillon and Abel,
1327 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Mr. Joseph Abel
Re: Governor Shepherd Apartment

Gentlemen:

In keeping with your recent request, we have been successful in having our manufacturer change the Face Brick order given us sometime ago by Mr. McInerney for the above project, even though they were already in production. You will re-call that our original order was to furnish Brick to match those recently used by Mr. McInerney in his Fifteenth Street Apartment. However, the factory will now eliminate approximately two-thirds of the Buff Brick in that particular range and will substitute Gray shades therefor, which will comply with the request of the Fine Arts Commission.

For your information, the factory is now in full production on the revised order and you may expect delivery of Brick on the job not later than three weeks from date.

We are very happy at all times to cooperate with the suggestions of the Fine Arts Commission and feel that we are very fortunate to have the factory make this change at this late date without penalty.

Very truly yours,

THE UNITED CLAY PRODUCTS COMPANY

J. M. Johnson

Assistant Treasurer.

JEM/t

EXHIBIT E

C O P Y

November 18, 1938.

Dear Mr. Abel:

The Commission of Fine Arts has been pleased to receive the letter addressed to you on October 25th by the United Clay Products Company, Investment Building, Washington, D. C., informing you that the factory which is making the brick for the Governor Shepherd Apartment will furnish gray brick for the building in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission.

The Commission at their meeting today expressed appreciation of your splendid cooperation and that of the United Clay Products Company in this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Joseph Abel,
Dillon and Abel,
1327 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E-1

APPENDIX 73
October 21, 1938
Meeting

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Report on Pennsylvania Ave. Building Line
for Central Library
in Municipal Center Area.

By William T. Partridge, Consulting Architect.

October 21, 1938

It is proposed to erect a Central Library building in Square 491 of the Municipal group. As the floor area required is small, too small for a normal occupancy of the land available, it is therefore planned to place the building back on the plot with the lines of the plan parallel with Constitution Avenue, disregarding the controlling diagonal line of Pennsylvania Avenue on which it fronts.

In order to establish a symmetry in the group plan, in which this building is a unit, it is proposed further to arbitrarily run a new wide diagonal avenue from the intersection of B. & Const. Aves. to C and First Street, thus destroying in part what otherwise would be desirable building space.

There is no practical need of this new Avenue and its aesthetic value is questionable. A frank acceptance of existing conditions would prove more economical, more simple, and therefore better planning.

The following facts are submitted for the purpose of showing why the Library building should be so designed that it will carry through the line of Pennsylvania Avenue as was originally planned.

Pennsylvania Avenue is the grand avenue of the Washington Plan - it connects the two main buildings around which the layout of the city was woven. It is two miles long, 160 feet wide, ample for its length, and despite many architectural "errors" in all styles - with towers and turrets in various building materials, and with a haphazard, ragged tree planting, has a dignity and impressiveness all its own. It is slightly concave in profile, just enough to lead the eye upward to the Capitol dome at the eastern end of the vista. Terminating the view, with the dome slightly off center, the eccentric relationship of the architectural lines of the basic structure to those of the Avenue is not offensive, mainly because this base is largely blotted out by planting.

EXHIBIT F

Looking westward from the upper stories of the Capitol - above the barrier of trees - we see at the end the south portico of the Treasury intruding into the picture at an awkward angle. This vista was originally aimed at the south portico of the White House, but President Washington, fearing accusations of ostentation, ordered the building so reduced in size that this south portico target was withdrawn so far north as to be out of the picture. Were the south Treasury wing removed, the White House could not be seen at all save from the western end of the Avenue.

At the middle of the length of the Avenue, at an important axis in the scheme of the plan, and at the intersection of two side Avenues was created a plaza, a "Square", as L'Enfant calls it, in which was to be placed a large fountain. The line of 8th Street was to be carried through a twin market building and across a boat basin. This structural line continued southward terminated at a naval column on the border of the river.

From this "Square", L'Enfant so planned his effects that a view was to be offered of the Capitol, the President's House, and the Judiciary, (the Supreme Court), where later the old City Hall was built in its stead.

In later years fortunately and fortuitously there was to be seen a view of the Washington Monument down former Louisiana Avenue, which we Washingtonians enjoyed until it was wiped out by the construction of the Triangle group.

Between this large "Square" and the White House a smaller Square was placed again midway. In both Squares their enclosing planes followed the rectangular street layout, while the roadway of the Avenue crossed diagonally at an angle of about 15 degrees.

The result of the introduction of these Squares was to cut the frontage of the Avenue itself in half. That is, from 6th to 15th Street, half of the buildings on the Avenue follow its diagonal lines, while the other half bordering the Squares stand at angles of 15 or 75 degrees to the Avenue. It is difficult to achieve a monumental effect when half of the planes which bound the Avenue intersect at all sorts of unrelated angles.

The balance between the street lines, the gridiron and the diagonal block would be a serious blow to the Avenue as a whole. If we wish to keep the line of Pennsylvania Avenue dominant, we cannot spare even a single factor which is parallel to it. We cannot afford to contribute to the gridiron plan a single plane to which it is not entitled.

On the south side looking west we have a single block parallel [illegible] line, the Apex building, then the Archives intercepts [illegible] line parallel to the gridiron street system. When the Triangle [illegible], there will be a long line of four blocks all parallel to [illegible]. Then another turn and three long blocks on the gridiron line to the Ellipse. Looking eastward the sweep of the Avenue does not really begin until we reach 13th Street. On the north from 15th to 6th Street, there are only four blocks carrying the cornice line of the Avenue - so we can ill afford to lose the value of the diagonal cornice on the Central Library site at the very beginning of the Avenue itself.

If this Library is placed on the Avenue line there will be formed a group - quite an accidental one - which creates a sort of portal at the meeting of Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues, on the middle of which looms the mass of the Apex building forming an attractive composition.

An additional reason that we should start with some control in design at the entrance to the Avenue is that from 6th Street westward all the north side is in private ownership, and while our Shipstead Act gives us control of the quality of design, and our zoning law the maximum height of private buildings, there is no assurance that these buildings will be uniform in height or will have a common cornice line.

The Standard Oil building offers an illustration. The original plan of that building showed a low, two story arcaded structure, occupying the western half of the block. That design was submitted to this Commission. When it was seen that there was no chance that the future owner of the eastern half would build anything in harmony with this, Colonel Grant explained the situation to Mr. Teagle and asked if the Standard Oil could possibly build upon the entire block, pointing out that this structure would occupy the all important north side of the future Union Square. Mr. Teagle then purchased the remaining land, but at such a huge figure that the only economical return on the investment was to construct not a two-story arcaded building, but one reaching the maximum height. So in our planning we should not count on any private ownership carrying out any pre-planned aesthetic effect.

It is imperative that the building line of the Central Library shall be parallel to the Avenue. The block opposite the Apex building being privately owned, we cannot depend upon the design of any building erected there being in harmony or in scale with the Federal structure, or that even a single building will be erected on the site.

C O P Y

November 26, 1938.

Dear Dr. Bowerman:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 18, 1938, gave careful consideration to your letter of November sixteenth, transmitting an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Library Trustees held on November tenth, concerning the proposed District of Columbia Library Building in Square 491 at Pennsylvania Avenue and John Marshall Place, Northwest.

The Commission took note of the fact that your Board desire a rectangular building with the principal facade parallel to Constitution Avenue, in preference to one trapezoidal in form with the principal facade parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue. At noon on the day of the last meeting, the Commission inspected the site for the proposed building and in the considered judgment of the members this Library Building should be built so that the principal facade is parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue, thus to form a portal with the existing Federal Trade Commission Building, at the junction of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues. It seemed important and desirable to continue the existing building line along Pennsylvania Avenue to John Marshall Place.

The Commission of Fine Arts therefore recommend that the new Library Building be built parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Dr. George F. Bowerman, Librarian,
Public Library of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F-1

C O P Y

November 26, 1938.

Dear Dr. Bowerman:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 18, 1938, gave careful consideration to your letter of November sixteenth, transmitting an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Library Trustees held on November tenth, concerning the proposed District of Columbia Library Building in Square 491 at Pennsylvania Avenue and John Marshall Place, Northwest.

The Commission took note of the fact that your Board desire a rectangular building with the principal facade parallel to Constitution Avenue, in preference to one trapezoidal in form with the principal facade parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue. At noon on the day of the last meeting, the Commission inspected the site for the proposed building and in the considered judgment of the members this Library Building should be built so that the principal facade is parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue, thus to form a portal with the existing Federal Trade Commission Building, at the junction of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues. It seemed important and desirable to continue the existing building line along Pennsylvania Avenue to John Marshall Place.

The Commission of Fine Arts therefore recommend that the new Library Building be built parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Dr. George F. Bowerman, Librarian,
Public Library of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F-1

APPENDIX C
October 21, 1938
Meeting

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Report on Building Lines for Extension
of Bureau of Natural History

By William T. Partridge, Consulting Architect

October 21, 1938.

The enlargement of the Natural History Museum has again been brought up for consideration. There are certain basic facts and architectural principles which should be kept in mind in arriving at any decision in the matter.

The most important point is to realize that this building is part of the Mall composition and its relationship to the Triangle group across Constitution Avenue is but secondary.

The Mall or Public Walk of L'Enfant is shown on his plan as a broad roadway bordered with gardens. Along the north and south boundaries of the spacious reservation is indicated a continuous row of buildings broken only by the many cross streets.

In Mr. Mckim's 1901 adaptation of the L'Enfant design, there was no central roadway but a "tapis vert". The composition was framed by two wide plantations of elms, the distance between them being very much less than between the continuous architectural borders of L'Enfant.

Mr. McKim's architectural features of the Mall were placed between the bordering elms and the present Avenues, Constitution and Independence.

His conception of the Mall group was a series of small buildings which would not compete in scale with the Capitol or Monument. They were to be so spaced that the cross street intersections would not form a gap in the rythm of white buildings and separations of green foliage. The cross streets were a necessity, and to reduce the width of the necessary opening, some of the adjoining buildings were shown located close to the cross street curb, and in the squares where there were more than one building, the interim space between them was excessive, if one considered the layout of the single square. At the cross axis of the Mall at 8th Street, the buildings were shown equa-distant from the north-south center line.

The first structure built under the 1901 plan was the Department of Agriculture. The next was the Museum of Natural History. The size of this building was so much greater than anything contemplated on the 1901 plan that it wrecked Mr. McKim's sequence of buildings and planting before it even started. Moreover, it introduced an increased scale in the size of the bordering buildings which today endangers the supremacy of the Capitol and Monument - at least until the maturing of the elms forms a mask.

From time to time proposals for the enlargement of this Museum have been advanced, each proposal planning a greater occupancy of the site. Today in place of the three buildings originally proposed, we are to have a single one nearly a thousand feet long, 250 feet longer than the Capitol.

The main east-west building lines were established as one hundred feet from the outside curb of Madison and Jefferson Drives. This dimension was arrived at only after a careful study in plan and on the site. If this set-back was then thought sufficient for the proposed small buildings, it is certainly not sufficient for a facade 980 feet long.

On the south side of the Mall, the shallow building area available will prevent the erection of any particularly long buildings, so we may see in the future some of Mr. McKim's architectural border scheme. The elevation of this building, together with the proposed additions, is so dependent upon its plan and mass, that we would suggest a further study of the architectural treatment of this unusually long facade.

While the relation of the building to the cross streets and to the lines of the new National Gallery to the east is important, the architectural treatment of the Mall facade is equally or even more vital. The additions bring the total length of the building to nearly a thousand feet, and the juncture of the new wings with the present building can be but slightly marked as they must project beyond the building line. This means that the horizontal lines must be continuous, and therefore the entrance portion and dome, now in proper scale with the size of the original building, will be woefully insufficient for a structure nearly twice the length.

The National Gallery of Art, the design of which seems inspired in mass at least by Mr. McKim's Union Square buildings (See page 41, 1901 Report) is a long building, but its length is broken by two strongly marked projecting wings and by a large central pediment. These motives facing south will cast strong shadows which, combined with the court planting, will produce much the effect sought by Mr. McKim, an alternation of light and shade.

The Madison Drive being narrow and the sidewalk only on the north, it will be difficult to obtain a satisfactory full view of either building from directly in front - so the design of the Mall facade of the Museum should be considered from a diagonal point of view, and a sharp one at that. Considerable study with sketches and models has led us to conclude that many of the defects arising from this extensive addition can be modified by the opening of two deep courts, where the additions join the main building. The monotony of the facade will be broken up by strong shadows. The scale of the central feature will remain unchanged.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

November 26, 1938.

Dear Dr. Wetmore:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 18th, 1938, considered the proposal to construct additions to the east and west ends of the Natural History Building along the Mall. Following an inspection of the site and the existing building and after having given the proposed plans for extension careful attention, the Commission respectfully urges your consideration of a different scheme for housing the growing collections.

The Natural History Building was built many years ago as a self-contained unit in the style of museum buildings in vogue at the beginning of this century. In the considered judgment of the Commission, additions to the east and west ends of the present structure, which of necessity would have to conform to the style of the old building, would create a structure altogether too large in mass for the Mall. Further, these proposed additions would result in causing the existing architectural elements, in particular the central composition of the building, including the dome, to become completely out of scale. The original structure was not designed in a manner to permit of extensive additions.

The Commission of Fine Arts realize the needs of the Smithsonian Institution for additional museum space. They therefore suggest the erection of a building in the square on the north side of the Mall, between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets, constructed in two sections above the first story on Constitution Avenue in such a manner as to retain the view from the Mall of the central portico of the Labor Department Building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke

Dr. Alexander Wetmore,
Assistant Secretary,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

GILMORE D. CLARKE,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT G-1

C O P Y

November 19, 1938.

Dear Admiral Moreell:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on November 18, 1938, considered the revised sketches which you submitted for the St. Inigoes Memorial. The Commission approve sketch A, suggesting a perpendicular monument.

The Commission advise that the proposed sculptural motif and inscription for the monument should be carved and not sandblasted. The design is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Rear Admiral B. Moreell,
Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks,
Navy Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

November 30, 1938.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The sketches which you submitted with your letter of November 5th, for two painted glass windows for the chapel at Mammoth Hot Springs, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, by Miss Jessie Van Brunt, Brooklyn, New York, received the attention of Mr. Savage, painter member of the Commission at their meeting on November 18, 1938.

The Commission disapprove the sketches because of unsuitable composition and style. It appears that in execution they would be no more than painted, and so an undesirable form of colored window.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer,
Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT I

C O P Y

November 19, 1938.

Dear Mr. Di Falco:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 18, 1938, gave further consideration to the question of location of the memorial to Guglielmo Marconi to be erected in the National Capital.

After inspecting several locations, the Commission decided on a site in the lower garden of Meridian Hill Park, directly west of the Statue of Dante, along Sixteenth Street. The inclosed photograph indicates the location.

Meridian Hill Park is the most prominent Italian Garden in this country. It was designed in large part by the late Ferruccio Vitale, landscape architect, of New York City, and who also at one time served as the landscape architect member of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission recommend as the architect of the memorial Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, 1228 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., who is the architect of Meridian Hill Park. He has consented to serve as architect of the memorial. The Commission have suggested that Mr. Peaslee design a comparatively low pedestal, as soon as the location and his services are accepted by your Committee, with such changes in the immediate surroundings as may be deemed necessary. The design of the pedestal would be subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. The portrait statue of Marconi by Mr. Piccirilli would be appropriate for the memorial in this location.

We have taken up the matter of location with officials of the National Park Service, and they have agreed to this site in the lower garden of Meridian Hill Park.

I shall be glad to hear of the action of your Committee in this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. S. Samuel Di Falco, Secretary,
The Marconi Memorial Foundation, Inc.,
270 Broadway,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT J

C C F

November 15, 1938.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Since my telephone conversation with you this morning, I have referred to our recent correspondence relative to the program for the competition to be held for the Stonewall Jackson Monument on the Battlefield at Manassas, Virginia.

In my letter of October 6, 1938, I suggested, that there be a joint action by the National and the State Art Commission, due to the law requiring the approval of both Commissions. This letter was acknowledged by you October 12, and by Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman, on behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts October 17, 1938, agreeing to cooperate with the two Virginia Commissions representing this State.

On October 26, 1938, I acknowledged this letter and sent a copy of the Rules and Specifications for the Competition, prepared by Mr. Thomas C. Colt, Jr., Director, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond.

On November 1, 1938, you acknowledged this letter and enclosure for The Commission of Fine Arts, stating that the Rules and Specifications were satisfactory, subject to one suggestion relative to the description of the base, which was accepted by this Commission and incorporated in the program.

If you will refer to the first page of the Prospectus under "Authority", you will note that the two Commissions will name the Jury to select the winning sculptor and that "the decision of the Jury will be final".

It was my understanding from your letter of November 1, 1938, that this was approved and Mr. Colt was proceeding with the printing of the competition program on this basis, as the time is short and it is important to start the competition at as an early date as possible.

I am submitting to you, for approval, the names of two sculptors who have agreed to serve; Mr. William Zorach and Mr. John Gregory. It is the wish of this Commission and of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts that Mr. Paul Manship serve on this Jury.

EXHIBIT K

The plan for the competition, including the membership of the Jury, as approved by the Virginia Art Commission on September 29, 1938, was attached to my letter of October 6, 1938, and I assume, included in the approval given by Mr. Clarke in his letter of October 17, 1938.

In consideration of the approval of the plans for the program submitted to you and approved by your Commission, I telephoned you this morning to ask if Mr. Manship could and would serve in a dual capacity, namely, as a sculptor member as well as the representative of the National Commission of Fine Arts. If this can not be done could and would Mr. Manship serve as the representative of your Commission, so that we as well as you could have his advice as a sculptor in which case it would be necessary to select a third sculptor member for the Jury. If this should become necessary, this Commission would be pleased to have your recommendations.

As my correspondence has tried to make clear, I feel that with the mutual consent of the various bodies having jurisdiction and with representation on the Jury, the question of the Jury's authority and the necessity for separate actions by the two Art Commissions could be avoided and the decision of the Jury made final, as incorporated in the Prospectus submitted to you and acknowledged and approved in your letter of November 1, 1938.

As you have expressed to me a doubt as to this method of procedure, will you not kindly bring these details to the attention of your Commission at its meeting next Friday and advise me as promptly as may be convenient so that there will be no further delay in advertising this competition.

Assuring you of my appreciation of the desire to cooperate, as expressed by your Commission, I am

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Philip N. Stern

PNS/C

cc? Mr. Thomas C. Colt.

C O P Y

November 19, 1938.

Dear Mr. Stern:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on November 18, were informed by Mr. Manship that he had notified you of the fact that he had declined to serve on the jury for the Stonewall Jackson Monument for the reason that the model to be selected by the jury would have to be submitted to the National Commission of Fine Arts, of which he is the sculptor member. The letter you addressed to Mr. Caemmerer on the 15th of November was read to the Commission at the meeting.

The Commission recommend the following for membership on the jury: Mr. John Gregory of New York City; Mr. Albert Stewart of Westport, Connecticut; and/or Mr. Michael Lantz of New Rochelle, New York.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Philip N. Stern,
Chairman and Secretary,
The Art Commission,
Commonwealth of Virginia,
Richmond, Virginia.

EXHIBIT A-1

C O P Y

November 29, 1938.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I enclose a copy of my letter of today's date to Mr. Edward D. Stone regarding the house in Rock Creek Park.

The color seems to be satisfactory and I therefore suggest that you notify the proper persons of its approval.

Very truly yours,

Wm. F. Lamb.

November 29, 1938.

Dear Mr. Stone:

I have your telephone memorandum that the finish of the residence near Rock Creek Park in Washington is to be a gray cement paint.

I do not believe it is necessary to submit a sample of this color, and I am recommending to the Commission the approval of your design.

Very truly yours,

Wm. F. Lamb.

EXHIBIT L

C O P Y

HOTEL ASSOCIATION OF
WASHINGTON, D. C., Inc.

November 15, 1938

Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

Your attention is respectfully invited to the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by this Association in meeting assembled, Monday November 14th.

"The Hotel Association of Washington, D. C. protests any change in the location of the proposed Thomas Jefferson Memorial from that location designated when the bill was passed by Congress.

It is our understanding that the bill passed by Congress was predicated on a designated location which did not embrace any change in the contour of the Tidal Basin, nor the road around it and would require the removal of only 27 cherry trees none of which would be those on the basin, whereas in this proposed change the present road, the contour of the basin and the removal of several hundred trees is contemplated. To this we strongly register our protest and demand the adherence by the Fine Arts Commission to the plan and location originally designated when the bill was passed by Congress.

If the present plan is adherred to, for a period of years the Cherry Blossoms will cease to be the national attraction to Washington they now represent and, may as a result, never again regain the national interest which they now have.

We are sure that our views are not only shared by the citizens of Washington and nearby cities and states but by them there is full concurrence. This was demonstrated by the spontaneous objections registered by neighboring cities and states and also hotel associations when the Thomas Jefferson Memorial location was discussed with the Library Committee of the House of Representatives."

EXHIBIT M

Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

November 15, 1938.

It is sincerely hoped that the Commission will take an interest in this matter and take such action as will prohibit the unnecessary destruction of the Tidal Basin Cherry Trees, one of the greatest assets of the Nation's Capital.

Yours respectfully,

HOTEL ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C. INC.,

(Signed) L. Gardner Moore

President

C O P Y

November 19, 1938.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts have received your letter of November 15, containing a copy of a resolution which was adopted by your Association on November 14, protesting against the removal of cherry trees along the Tidal Basin in connection with the erection of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. We wish to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts does not approve the building that is to be erected for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial on this site.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. I. Cardner Moore,
President,
Hotel Association of Washington,
321 Second National Bank Building,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N-1

C O P Y

November 26, 1938.

Dear Mr. Simon:

For several y ars, in fact ever since the approval of the Act of Congress, approved March 2, 1929, providing for the erection on public grounds in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Oscar S. Straus, the Commission of Fine Arts has been expecting that the site selected for the memorial on Fourteenth Street, in the Great Plaza opposite the Department of Commerce Building, will be made available for it. The space is now used for a very unsightly open-air garage.

The Oscar Straus Memorial Association is ready to spend fully $200,000 on this memorial, which is to be a large fountain appropriately designed for the Great Plaza. The Commission of Fine Arts have hoped for an appropriation of $500,000, which it is understood will be necessary for the complete development of the Great Plaza. However, to avoid further delay, would you please inform me what it would cost simply to grade the Great Plaza? Assuming that it would not cost more than about $50,000, would the Treasury Department agree to the grading of the Great Plaza, so as to make available the site for the Oscar Straus Memorial?

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N

17. Municipal Center Plans: Central Library Building: (See also Pars. 15 and 19):

MR. WYETH, Municipal Architect, present for discussion of this subject.

MR. WYETH presented a series of studies for the Municipal Center, showing the proposed Central Library building and the widening of John Marshall Place between the two buildings. They have in no way attempted to solve the traffic problem at 4th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue at present, but have studied the question of the width between buildings on the lower portion of John Marshall Place, whether it should be 241 feet, 280 feet, or 310 feet. They believe 280-foot width would give a better arrangement. The plan was originally approved with a width of 310 feet.

The Chairman of the Commission, in discussing this matter, felt that it might be better to somewhat reduce the 310-foot width.

Discussion included the building line for the Central Library and whether the building line should parallel Pennsylvania Avenue or Constitution Avenue; the feeling that it might be a mistake to attempt to balance all of the development on a north and south axis, but create another axis parallel to the National Gallery of Art, and another in relation to the Standard Oil building; that consideration should be given to maintaining the cornice line along Constitution Avenue; the feeling of the Fine Arts Commission that they concur with MR. PARTRIDGE'S report on this subject, and are in accord with the idea that the library should be parallel with Pennsylvania Avenue; the danger of making the space between the library and suggested auditorium buildings too great, and the possibility of reducing it to 241 or 280 feet; changing the width of the plaza on John Marshall Place if diagonal parking is eliminated, and allowing parallel parking on one side of the street only; feeling of the Municipal Architect that he would be agreeable to the elimination of diagonal parking on this street; revising the width of John Marshall Place plaza by varying the width by a series of reductions; suggestion of placing the buildings closer together so there is a distance of only 280 feet between them, and gradually widening to the south until a width of 310 feet is obtained.

MOTION unanimously carried by both Commissions that the east facade of the Central Library building and the west facade of the future building to the east thereof be 280 feet apart, with an extension on the north or C Street end of the buildings to line up with the 241 foot space between the Municipal Center buildings.

The Chairman stated that the Commission's action means that the facade between buildings will be 280 feet apart on John Marshall Place except at the north end where a projection will reduce this width to 241 feet.

As to the question of the Pennsylvania Avenue facade of the library building, the Chairman stated that it is his understanding that the two Commissions are in agreement that the building line should parallel Pennsylvania Avenue.

Further discussion included the traffic situation at 4th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue; that the area east of the library might be considered as a site for an auditorium or concert hall.

DR. GEORGE F. BOWERMAN, Librarian of the D. C. Public Library, appeared before the Commission in connection with the library building.

The Chairman informed him that this Commission and the Fine Arts Commission are in accord with the recommendation that the building line for this building should parallel Pennsylvania Avenue.

DR. BOWERMAN stated that the rectangular type of building seems more desirable to them for the reason that it lends itself better to interior planning than the trapezoid type of building, and also from the point of view of administration. The rectangular building would be economical to maintain and operate. One of their main considerations is the desirability of keeping maintenance expenses down to a minimum.

DR. ALBERT W. ATWOOD, of the Building Committee of the Public Library, stated that the Board of Trustees feel that a building running parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue would be more expensive to maintain, and that they desired to be as economical as possible in their maintenance cost.

MR. NOLEN pointed out that the space needed for the library is considerably less than that possible to provide on the square, and there is a possibility of some other use being made of the remainder of the square, or even in the same building.

MAJ. GILMORE CLARKE suggested that a preliminary design be made to fit the whole plot, and that only such part of the building be erected as the library will need; that from the standpoint of planning of the city, it would be better to have a building designed to fit the entire lot. He also suggested that a plan be devised for the entire facade and build such portions necessary for the library at this time. MR. WYETH felt that this could be done.

In discussing this matter, the Chairman felt that a building might be designed to be built in two stages, undertaking part of it at this time and the balance at some future time.

MR. WYETH stated that he felt the entrances to the building could be designed satisfactorily to all concerned, and that he will attempt to develop a plan of the whole area.

18. Extension of Museum Building:

MR. LOUIS SIMAN, Supervising Architect, and DR. ALEXANDER WETMORE, Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, in charge of the National Museum, present for discussion of this subject.

MR. NOLEN, in reviewing this matter, stated that about a year ago the Commission expressed the opinion that the wings of the Museum building should be kept 100 feet back from the curb of 9th Street, but the record does not show that any formal action was taken concerning the setback on 12th Street. Following discussion with the Commission of Fine Arts, the staff recently prepared a plan showing what the problems are on the basis of the 100-foot setback, both on 9th Street and on the west end of the building in connection with the connecting roadway at 12th Street from the Mall to Constitution Avenue, and the additional service drive passing under the entrance steps at the west end of the building. The staff feels that the setback at the west end is about correct, as the distance between the connecting and service roads will provide a satisfactory approach to the building.

MAJ. CLARKE stated - "While I do not know what the requirements are, I rather feel that it would be common-sense to build another building to the west of 12th Street and occupy portions of that adjacent plot. I would like to see the central axis kept open between the Agriculture and Departmental Auditorium buildings, so there would be in that plot two buildings from the Mall side with a one-story connection only showing from Constitution Avenue, and if that whole plot could be allocated to them, you could put one building equal to the area of the two proposed additions on the one lot. By leaving the space between the porticoes and putting a flight of monumental steps between them, you could have a connection through the basements. I believe that it would be cheaper to build one building than to have this present building with additions so overpowering on the Mall. We believe that would be the better thing to do. You would merely abandon putting any additional wings on the present building."

Further discussion included the needs of the Smithsonian Institution for additional space.

DR. WETMORE explained to the Commission the needs for additional space. He stated further that from the standpoint of organization, it is important to have as much space under the same roof as possible, and if the additional wings are constructed as now planned, there will ultimately be need for additional space which can be obtained to the west.

MAJ. CLARKE stated further that the present time is ideal to go into the question of utilizing the area to the west of 12th Street, because the external arrangement of the Mall is more important than the internal arrangement of the buildings.

DR. WETMORE stated further that it is desirable to keep their activities together from the point of view of convenience to visitors, as well as carrying on their particular scientific functions.

Further discussion included suggestion of a survey of the actual future needs of the Museum people; the desire of the Museum people to establish an exhibit bearing on the preservation of architectural developments; proposal to erect a National Gallery of Art in the Mall; study of the future requirements of the Museum; that it would probably be cheaper to build a building to the west of 12th Street than to extend the present building on account ofconstruction difficulties that would probably be encountered.

It was agreed that the Chairman of this Commission would appoint a Committee consisting of representatives of the Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the Procurement Division, and the Smithsonian Institution to study this matter and go into the future space requirements of the National Museum.

19. Municipal Center Plans: (See also Pars. 15 and 17):

MR. NOLEN stated that the foundation plans for the plaza and two municipal buildings are ready for the action of the two Commissions, and COL. McCOACH desires pro ıpt action so that there will be no delay in connection with the work.

MAJ. CLARKE, representing the Commission of Fine Arts, and MR. HUBBARD, representing this Commission, were designated to go into this matter and act for and on behalf of these Commissions as to conformity with plans previously approved.

20. War Department Building: (See also Par. 16):

MR. REYNOLDS and MR. SIMON of the Procurement Division, present for discussion of this subject.

MR. PARTRIDGE against submitted his report on this subject, together with accompanying studies, attached hereto as APPENDIX A.

Discussion included the importance of 22nd Street north of Virginia Avenue, as compared with its unimportance south of that Avenue; future expansion of the War Department group under MR. PARTRIDGE'S plans; reservation of the square north of the proposed plaza for future expansion; the fact that the Procurement Division closed 22nd Street at first and now retains it; feeling of MR. REYNOLDS that the building design suggested by MR. PARTRIDGE is not as large as the one submitted by the Procurement Division; that the space requirements of the War Department have been reduced since the original plans were discussed, and the requirements are now 1,110,000 square feet; that the Procurement Division is providing no more entrances than are considered absolutely necessary; that the concentration under the Procurement Division plans for the War Department is less than that on the Interior Department site; feeling of the staff that the required space can be provided on the basis suggested by MR.

PARTRIDGE; the feeling of doubt in the mind of MR. REYNOLDS that MR. PARTRIDGE'S plan will provide the required space; that the Procurement Division has the money available to begin immediately the head-house of this building; that MR. PARTRIDGE'S plan is an attempt to preserve the elements of the original plan for this whole Northwest Rectangle area; feeling that the building, as now planned, would not be adequate to meet the needs of the War Department in case of an emergency; that Congress has authorized the erection of this building on the site indicated by the Procurement Division; the question of closing 22nd Street to make the plan more flexible; feeling of the Commission that there is too intensive use of land in the Pennsylvania Avenue Triangle; the suggestion of extending the building northward to provide for future expansion; the question of retaining the park strip north of the building group, and the question of extending this westward to the river; the fact that the bulk of the building shown on MR. PARTRIDGE'S plan, as viewed from the Lincoln Memorial, would look less than the building proposed by the Procurement Division; that the Treasury Department is now preparing estimates for a building west of the War Department group; development of the plaza around an axis from the intersection of the two diagonals instead of from an arbitrary point as proposed by the Procurement Division; whether 22nd Street could be closed and the whole composition moved westward; desirability of locating the main building on the axis of the plaza centered on the two diagonals; suggestion of MR. W. A. DELANO that the smaller building of the War Department be moved northward slightly and changes be made at the corners of the larger building.

MAJ. CLARKE feels that the facade shown on MR. PARTRIDGE'S study is acceptable.

The Procurement Division agreed to make further studies of this matter along the lines suggested by the Commission.

21. Gallatin Statue:

The Chairman stated that a proposal had been made some time ago that the Gallatin Statue be located on the triangle north of the Commerce building. Original legislation enacted some time ago provided that it should be located on the west front of the Treasury. The Commission of Fine Arts suggested that instead of locating it on the west front of the building, it would be better located on the north front, where a fountain is now located, and suggested that the fountain be removed and turned over to the Park Office and located elsewhere.

MR. SETTLE stated that so far as the Treasury Department is concerned, they are proposing to request the Secretary to consider moving the fountain in front of the Treasury and locating it elsewhere, but before doing this, they desire the views of the two Commissions. The Act has been amended allowing this change.

MOTION unanimously carried by the two Commissions approving a joint resolution that a location for the Gallatin Statue on the west front of the Treasury is not as suitable as a location on the north front of the building.